efficiency of the most gifted. But why are these things hid—why have their gifts a curtain before them? There is no class of persons more decidedly required to be men of the world than we are; no calling in which monkish qualities are so little in repute as in our own; and yet, with all that has been preached about the internal economy of the profession, but very little attention has been paid to its external relations with society at large. We are deficient in activity and *esprit de corps;* we do not interest ourselves about many matters where medicine has a divided claim with other arts and sciences; we allow this neutral ground to be taken up by a set of interlopers, who are neither one thing nor another; and we have our own sluggishness to blame. But *fas est ab hoste doceri.* We are nothing, if not servants of the public: the most accurate system of medical policy would fail in its ultimate end—utility, if it did not enable men to communicate their acquirements, and join to the *savoir* a certain portion of the *savoir faire.*

MR. EARLE AND THE LANCET.

The old saying of "having caught a tartar," is excellently illustrated by the subjoined letter, which the Editor of the Lancet has drawn upon himself by his defiance of Mr. Earle, and daring that gentleman to vindicate his late address to the students who attend his Clinical Lectures. The straight-forward and spirited conduct of Mr. Earle on this occasion is in keeping with his general character; and the unanswerable manner in which he has exposed the falsehood and duplicity of the common traducer, is such as to place that worthy in no very enviable situation.

The facts are briefly these. Wakley had been in the habit, for a considerable period, of doing all he could to injure Mr. Earle's reputation; a purpose, to accomplish which he had recourse to calling him ridiculous names, to malicious insinuations, and to direct and positive falsehoods. During the last few months, however, Mr. Earle has, strange to say, been treated in a manner totally different; the *sobriquet* by which he had been designated was changed for his proper name; his cases were carefully reported; his remarks faithfully recorded—nay, the pupils have been recommended to attend his lectures; and, lastly, these lectures have been published. All this, however, we are now told, was done in irony! This is not quite fair; the Editor ought not to veil the brilliancy of his wit too much, but to have some consideration for the duller humour of his readers—else he must be content to be his own audience, and laugh at his jokes himself.

One of our earliest recollections is of an old gentleman who was an inveterate punster, but, like Wakley's irony, his wit was sometimes of that peculiar kind which no one but the author comprehends: now whenever a joke missed fire, his wife invariably said, "that's a pun;" and, of course, the expected laugh was sure to follow. We advise Wakley to adopt the old lady's plan, and, instead of following up the subject three months after with an explanation, to put at once as an addendum—"*This is in irony.*"

The circumstances above-mentioned led to an idea, among those who did not know Mr. Earle, that he had in some way sought the change; in fact, that he had done something to effect it. Here, however, the matter would probably have rested, had not he received a formal application from the acknowledged reporter to the Lancet, in his official capacity as such, for the notes of his lectures, backed by all those professions as to the sentiments of his employer to which we alluded in a former number.

The indirect and more distant hints

of Mr. Wakley's *attachment* had been passed unnoticed; but this was going a step too far, and Mr. Earle took the most prompt and effectual method of shewing to the world the contempt with which he spurned the adulations of his quondam reviler, by publicly expressing his sentiments, in an address to his class.

One would have thought the dilemma rather a puzzling one even for Wakley; but not at all: he has only to adopt a certain figure of speech, that he has always at command, and which often serves those who have nerve enough to use it freely. He has but boldly to deny point blank whatever it does not suit him to admit. To be sure it requires his readers to be fools, but he has often drawn so successfully on their credulity that he is not to be easily disconcerted. Grant him but a certain portion of faith, and as to the rest "'tis as easy as lying." "It is not true," says the Editor of the Lancet, just as confidently as if he expected to be believed. To what extent an assertion of the Lancet, taken *per se*, may be good for any thing in the remoter parts of the island, we know not; but it can only be upon his country readers that he can hope to impose by such monstrous absurdities.

In former times, when lances, and not Lancets, were wielded for men's destruction, if any one of honourable blood denied the statement of another, they held a tournament, and tilted for their honour and their lives before assembled multitudes. Now so chivalrous has our contemporary grown, that he wishes to restore this ancient custom: he offers to come to St. Bartholomew's, attended by his reporter, as his squire, "on any evening that Mr. Earle may appoint," then and there, for the instruction and edification of the pupils, to enter into mortal combat with Mr. Earle touching the insult offered to his spotless honour. If Mr. Earle does not accept this most wise proposal, it will be evident to the whole profession, adds the valiant Editor, "that he dare not."

We never before read such a piece of fanfaronade even in the pages of the Lancet. A pretty scene it would be for Mr. Earle, or any respectable man, to have a common blustering bully admitted to his class-room to insult him. We have already said, and we repeat, that the person who communicated to Mr. Earle, Wakley's expression of respect, and who asked him for his notes, was Mr. M'Cristie, the reporter of the Lancet. Wakley will probably deny that he sent him; nay, we doubt not that he deputed him to speak to Mr. Earle instead of doing so himself, on purpose that he might deny it if the bait did not take. He contented himself with throwing out *feelers*, that he might draw back if it was requisite; and we doubt not but that those over whom he has sufficient influence will be forthwith instructed to eat up their words again—if their conscience be not "*too tender.*" The whole letter of Mr. Earle we dare swear we shall be told amounts to nothing.

Are, then, the statments of Mr. M'Cristie nothing? Are the damning charges of Mr. Weekes nothing? Were the expressions of "respect" communicated through Dr. Armstrong nothing? Were those of Mr. Fay nothing? Was the total change in the manner of speaking of Mr. Earle, in the Lancet nothing? Was recommending the pupil to attend his lectures, nothing? Was publishing these lectures, nothing?

> Why then the world, and all that's in't is nothing,
> If this be nothing.

MR. EARLE'S ANSWER TO WAKLEY'S DEFIANCE.

To the Editor of the London Medical Gazette.

Sir,

In requesting your insertion of the following letter to the Editor of the Lancet, I feel that an apology is due from me to my more respectable brethren for

condescending to notice the ribaldry of his publication. I beg to assure them that I have been actuated by the consideration that in addressing the Editor, I was in fact addressing his readers; and by a conviction that the abuses of the press can only be satisfactorily restrained through the medium of the press. I have sent a copy of this letter to him, and have claimed his promise to publish it.

I am, Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
HENRY EARLE.

George-Street, Nov. 16, 1829.

To the Editor of the Lancet.

George Street, Nov. 15, 1829.

SIR,

FOR the first time in my life I condescend to address you in reply to your slanderous observations—your bold defiance—and your barefaced denial of the statement which I was compelled to make to my clinical class. I am induced to take the present step because I do not wish to make the lecture-room an arena for disputes. I am further induced to take this step, instead of inviting you to hear my reply in that theatre before a jury of my own pupils, because I should be apprehensive that your reception might not be quite cordial; and because the attachment and regard which they have uniformly manifested towards me would ill suit them for the office of jurors. Influenced by these motives, I prefer making the public the jury to try the present question, and your own publication the medium of communication.

I shall pass over, in silent contempt, all the low abuse and silly puerile calling of names, so worthy of a scientific journal, as they are evidently the first angry effusions of an evil spirit, which has received just castigation, but not profited by it.

I shall proceed to meet the charges: and, first, that "after a week's preparation I am unable to speak intelligibly on disease and its treatment for the space of one hour." For the truth of this statement I appeal to my audience, whom you rightly represent as "enlightened." My reply to it is this: it is my custom to select the cases on the Friday, during my visit, and I often do not receive the notes of the cases from the pupils until the Saturday evening when I enter the theatre. That I am not afraid of publishing my remarks, when the subject is of sufficient importance to merit the attention of the public, the pages of the Medical Gazette, and of the Medical and Physical Journal, will amply attest. Did it not, however, strike you, who profess to be the lover of openness and fair dealing, in making this attack upon me for declining to have my extempore lectures published, that you were in duty bound to notice the conduct of Mr. Lawrence, who has withdrawn his written consent to have his lectures published, because they were not fit to meet the public eye? lectures forming a systematic course, embracing the whole of surgery; lectures which he has been years in compiling; which he delivered to his class in Aldersgate Street, and for which he received an ample remuneration. I shall only offer one more observation on this part of your paper: how did it happen that you only discovered the worthlessness of my lectures at the moment when you were refused permission to publish them? But for that refusal you would still have been too happy to have culled the fruits of my experience, to sustain your falling publication.

Your observations respecting the lectures not being gratuitous, are too absurd to merit a single word in reply.

You next state, that "it was a glaring piece of irony which was inserted in the Lancet of October 5th;" in which you say, "Mr. Earle, to his credit be it spoken, &c. &c." Was it in irony, that in a former number, in your address to the new pupils arriving in London, you particularly recommended them to attend Mr. Lawrence's lectures on the principles of surgery, *and Mr. Earle's clinical lectures?* I have to regret much that your irony was so masked as to deceive my friends and the public, and to lead some to suppose that I had for a moment "listened to the voice of the charmer;" an imputation which cost me a sensation of real pain, which I never felt from all the abuse which ever fell from your pen.

You next state, in reply to my assertion, that you persecuted me most maliciously for years, with all the aspersions which falsehood and malignity could invent, "that the readers of the Lancet require no contradiction of this falsehood." Allow me to refresh their memories, and to take one single instance from many. Let me refer them to No. 233, for Saturday, Feb. 16th, 1828,

page 722. They will there find your comments on a case of injury of the head, reported in the same number, at page 720. The case was briefly as follows: a patient was admitted with a severe injury of the head, which was very actively treated without success. Symptoms of pressure came on; such as paralysis of the bladder and rectum; loss of sensation of one side, with convulsive action of the muscles on the same side. The sloughy state of the wound in the scalp clearly pointed out the principal seat of the injury. Under these circumstances, it was determined, in a consultation with Mr. Vincent and Mr Stanley, to give the patient the possible chance of recovery by the application of the trephine. At the moment when the operation was determined on, Mr. Lawrence entered the ward; and, after a few moments' observation, declared he could see no other indication except that the man would certainly die. As he would not condescend to enter into any further explanation, I did not consider it incumbent upon me to abandon my own opinion, sanctioned as it was by that of Mr. Vincent and Mr. Stanley. The operation was performed, and blood was found effused beneath the dura mater. The patient improved after the operation, and made an attempt to speak. He survived the operation 36 hours. On dissection, above *four ounces of blood* were found effused upon the brain. Here, then, was a case in which it was most apparent to any person of common sense that Mr. Lawrence had given a hasty and most erroneous opinion, as that gentleman could not see that there existed any symptoms of pressure, nor any other indication except that the man would die. Either from your own ignorance of practical surgery, or your unjustifiable belief in the ignorance of your readers, or from your hopes that they would only read your slanderous comment, without reference to the case itself, which contains so palpable a contradiction to your remarks, you select this case as a text for a most malicious and false attack upon my character. It is quite sufficient for you that Mr. Lawrence differed from me in opinion; and you extol that gentleman to the skies, and endeavour, proportionally, to degrade me in the opinion of your readers. I say *you* have done this; for you must know, although you dared to put the slander into the mouth of your reporter, that the whole of it was a gratuitous fabrication of your own. Mr. Weekes, who was appointed house-surgeon by Mr. Lawrence, was the hired reporter at that time, with the sanction and approbation of Mr. Lawrence. Mr. Weekes admitted, before nearly all the medical staff of the hospital, the treasurer, and almoners, that he sent the report of the case as published at page 720, but most solemnly denied that he had uttered one syllable of the scandal which is put into his mouth, or in any way sanctioned the malicious observations contained in your comments; nay, more, Mr. Weekes declared that he had remonstrated with you for abusing his name, and uttering your slanders under the cloak of a reporter: to which your reply was, "that his conscience was too tender."

Your object in thus attempting to rob me of my reputation, needs no observation from me. This one instance will probably suffice to convince your readers of your malice and your falsehood; if they require more, I will refer them to my letter, in the second number of the Medical Gazette.

You next state, that you have not urged, directly or indirectly, that you were sensible you had injured me, and were willing to make reparation. Facts are obstinate things, and I might leave it to your readers to judge by your actions—by your gradually altered tone and respectful mention of my name, whenever you have of late had occasion to refer to the cases under my care and the operations which I have performed. These I consider as substantial proofs of your wish to conciliate and make reparation; but I possess other proof in support of my assertions. My late neighbour, *your friend*, Mr. Fay, the dentist, repeatedly assured me that you entertained a respect for me, and threw out many insinuations against the principal actors behind the scenes. My reply to that gentleman was, "Sir, I do not ask you whether you are authorised to make this communication to me, but you are perfectly at liberty to tell the editor of the Lancet, that, if such be his real sentiments towards me, he is even more base than I imagined."—Dr. Armstrong, who was called to attend some branches of your family, also assured me *that you were quite satisfied with my public conduct;* for which, as in duty bound, I feel most truly grateful. Lastly, your own reporter, Mr. M'Cristie, about a

twelvemonth since, called on me, in consequence of my remonstrance with Mr. Lawrence for taking money from an acknowledged reporter, and, in conversation, informed me that you had declared to him that all your enmity towards me arose from a belief that I had been a contributor to a subscription raised for the purpose of crushing the Lancet; but that, in every other respect, you were perfectly satisfied with my conduct, and entertained a respect for me. Here, then, was a direct avowal of the *pure disinterested motives* which influenced you in reviewing the conduct of a man holding an important public office. The same gentleman, on being informed that I had never contributed one shilling either in favour of, or against the Lancet, intimated that he was sure that you would endeavour to make some reparation, and wished me to direct his attention to any cases I wished him to report. My reply was, "that I had never made the slightest objection to the fair and impartial publication of every act of mine, as surgeon of St. Bartholomew's; but that I never would, directly or indirectly, sanction a publication in which I had been so slandered." From that time I have been spoken of decently, have been called by my proper name, and have frequently been mentioned with commendation; and these I consider as substantial proofs of your desire to make reparation.

You next deny that you made application for the notes of my lectures. In my address to the students, I did not state that YOU had; but I have no hesitation, on the present occasion, in positively affirming that your reporter called upon me, a few days before my address to the pupils, and, after stating that my lectures were highly appreciated, requested me to furnish him with a copy of my notes. "Qui facit per alterum, facit per se." It is true he never stated that he came directly from you, but I had a right to conclude that he did so with your knowledge; and had I furnished him with any manuscripts to place in your hands, I well know the use you would have made of them;—from that moment I should have become an humble tool in your hands, as others have, to their cost. With respect to your request that I would correct the proofs of my lectures, *I never asserted any thing of the kind.* My expression was, that I was well aware, by correcting the press, &c. that I might gain a certain share of popularity; but this by no means implied that I had been required to do so.

And now, that I have answered your bold defiance, and given you my authorities, and that I have furnished you with proofs of your falsehood and malignity, it remains only for me to express the proud satisfaction which I experience, after so long discharging the arduous duties of surgeon to a large public institution, that my conduct, which has been open to all, has been censured only by a pamphlet whose character for truth is now pretty generally appreciated; and further, that I am now in a situation to be able fearlessly to encounter and expose a public slanderer, who has too long been permitted to send forth his falsehoods with impunity.

I send you this letter because you have pledged yourself to publish whatever I might urge in reply to your challenge, and I now call upon you to redeem your pledge. Fearing, however, that it might be imperfectly understood by your compositor, I have thought proper to send a copy of it to the Editor of the Gazette.

I am, Sir,

HENRY EARLE.

P.S.—There is one other point on which I omitted to make any observation in my letter sent last night. You state that "it is curious that my objections were not made until after the non-publication of my third lecture, and intimate that my vanity was wounded by the omission. At the moment when you penned this paragraph, *you must have known* that you did not possess the materials for publishing my third lecture; that your reporter had applied to me to furnish him with the notes, and was peremptorily refused. As you promise to publish, "without curtailment," all that I shall urge, I desire that this may be added as a postscript to the letter of

HENRY EARLE.

PROCEEDINGS OF SOCIETIES.

HUNTERIAN SOCIETY.

Nov. 4, 1829.

Cerebral Affections.

DR. WHITING related an interesting case of disease of the brain. The pa-

tient was a young lady, and the disease seemed to commence in the frontal sinuses. She had pain about these sinuses, and a bloody fluid was discharged from the nostrils. As the disease advanced, a sense of stunning occurred; on which a tendency to coma and a difficulty of expressing herself correctly supervened. The urgency of the symptoms fluctuated, but the disease terminated fatally.

Examination.—A quantity of pus was found in the anterior lobes of the cerebrum, above the frontal sinuses; but the dura mater did not appear to have given way. The larger quantity of this pus was on the left side. The inner table of the frontal bone was destroyed by caries, and there was a communication between the cavity of the cranium and the frontal sinuses. The dura mater was not adherent to the brain, but the convolutions of the anterior lobe of the left hemisphere were nearly obliterated. Within the substance of the left hemisphere there was a cyst, containing about four ounces of a sort of gelatinous fluid, not so opaque as pus. The cyst was so dense as to admit of being taken out, and no communication could be detected between it and the membranes. The membrane of the frontal sinuses appeared to have undergone thickening. The Doctor conceived that the cyst was an hydatid.

Various cases of head affection were mentioned by other members. Among others,

Dr. Babington mentioned a case of abscess within the substance of the brain, and a remarkable feature presented at the onset of the disease. The child was seized with a propensity to run round the room, and cried, "don't stop me; it is so funny!" He also adverted to the case of the lamented Dr. Wollaston, as elucidating the slowness of these diseases, as well as their insidiousness. The particulars have appeared in the Gazette.

Mr. Callaway had twice performed paracentesis capitis. In one child, two years and a half old, he operated repeatedly, and with relief; but the child died of measles. The second patient was younger, and died apparently from irritation.

HOSPITAL REPORTS.

HOTEL DIEU.

Encysted Hydrocele of the Spermatic Cord.

A boy, twelve years of age, was operated upon at the Hôtel Dieu, for hydrocele of the left side, in 1828. He was treated by injection, and left the hospital perfectly cured. Some months afterwards, there appeared in the groin opposite the inguinal ring a small tumor, which was soft, indolent, fluctuating, and without any discoloration of the skin. This swelling seems to have been taken for hernia, for a bandage was recommended. Notwithstanding the use of this, however, the tumor continued to increase; in consequence of which the patient entered the hospital again last month.

A roundish, slightly elongated tumor, as large as a full-sized pigeon's egg, presented itself opposite the inguinal ring. It began about half an inch from this point, and terminated near the epididymus. Although pretty tense, it was fluctuating, and without any change in the appearance of the skin. No shock was communicated to the hand when placed on the swelling while the patient coughed. It could be made to return into the interior of the inguinal canal, but it was perceived to be insolated there. There was a manifest transparency in the tumor. These appearances led M. Dupuytren to regard it as an encysted hydrocele of the cord, and he proposed to treat it by incision.

The operation was performed Oct. 13. The boy was placed on his back, and an incision made into the skin covering the tumor. This incision was made with as much care as in a case of hernia, lest there had been any mistake in the diagnosis, and to avoid the risk of wounding any part of the spermatic cord. The subjacent layers were successively divided, and a jet of lemon-coloured serum announced the opening into the cyst. The opening was enlarged by means of a bistoury and scissors. The finger introduced into it could detect no communication; the serum it had contained was entirely evacuated, and the cavity was filled with charpie, to produce suppuration, and subsequent adhesion of the parietes of the cyst.

The charpie was removed in a few